



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,599	09/21/2001	Steven M. Geiger	213828013US2	6626

25096 7590 02/28/2003

PERKINS COIE LLP  
PATENT-SEA  
P.O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

FRIDIE JR, WILLMON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

09/960599

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Geiger et al.

Examiner

Willmon Fridie

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 16, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 15-19, and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 2,3,5-9,15,16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EPO ('217) in view of Hoffman.

EPO ('217) discloses a coin discriminator having a discriminator printer and inherently discloses the claimed method except for the teaching of placing visible security marks on the voucher that have security properties. Hoffman teaches that it is well known in the art to place

Art Unit:

visible security marks on a substrate that have security properties such that they have a second appearance when they are photocopied. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide EPO('217) with visible security marks on its voucher that have security properties such that they have a second appearance when they are photocopied in the manner as taught by Hoffman in order to add an extra measure of security to the financial transaction.

In regard to claims 5 and 6, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use florescent ink, since it has been held to be within the general skill level of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 7-9,15,16,18 and 19, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the indicia in any desired location, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Further in regard to claims 7-9,15,16,18 and 19, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed indicia since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed

Art Unit:

matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability.

4. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EPO ('217) in view of Hoffman as applied to claims 2,3,5-9,15,16,18 and 19 above, and further in view of Puckett et al. .

EPO ('217) as modified by Hoffman discloses the claimed invention except for a voucher formed of thermal paper Puckett et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to use thermal paper for vouchers, receipts, etc.. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide EPO ('217) as modified by Hoffman with thermal paper in the manner as taught by Puckett et al in order to increase the versatility of the printing process.

In regard to claim 17, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed indicia since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter

Art Unit:

the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claim 21 is allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group...***Official- (703)872-9302...After Final-(703) 872 9303***. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3700 will be promptly forward to the examiner.

Art Unit:


Any inquiries concerning issues other than the substantive content of this and previous communications, such as missing references or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service Representative, Tech Center 3700, (703) 306-5648.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. Fridie, jr. whose telephone number is (703) 308-1866.

wf

February 9, 2003



**WILLMON FRIDIE, JR.**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**